

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 3-13 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being independent. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 13 is newly added. Support for the claim amendments and addition can be found in the original disclosure at least at page 5, lines 7-12, page 9, line 18 – page 10, line 22, and page 14, lines 1-25.

Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,966,121 (Hubbell). Claims 6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Hubbell in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,394 (Kim). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejections, and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, independent claim 1 is amended herein, as discussed during the interview, to clarify features of the synchronization operation. Claim 2 is canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein, thereby rendering the rejection of that claim moot.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-13 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons discussed during the interview and outlined below.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus and as presently presented recites, among other things, “logic providing a multimedia navigator program, a control application programming interface (API) and an information API, the control and

information APIs being configured to respond to flags that selectively determine if at least one operation will be conducted, the operation being selected from a group of operations that includes a player-navigator synchronization operation comprising:

causing a multimedia player application to output a request command to the navigator program; and

causing the multimedia navigator program to subsequently return to the player application upon commencement, completion or cancellation of the requested command:

(i) an event identifier notifying the multimedia player application when the requested command is completed and (ii) a status result status result indicating whether the request command succeeded or failed."

Hubbell is directed to a hypervideo editing system including a wordprocessing system and a separate video playback system. Hubbell describes that an author of a hypervideo application identifies particular frames of the video displayed by the video playback system and creates a mark video file that defines the type and functional characteristics of various hypervideo controls, marks, and actions using the wordprocessing system. (Col. 3, lines 11-16.)

Hubbell defines the terms "mark" and "mark video file" as follows:

A "mark" is a generic term within the context of a hypervideo application or document that defines an association between a "place" or frame of a video segment and a particular hypervideo action. In general, a hypervideo application is developed to include a number of marks, some of which are defined as hypervideo controls, actions, and functions, for example.

A "mark video file" is a data file containing information that defines the type and functionality of hypervideo controls, marks, actions, or functions. A mark video file

typically contains a number of "mark files" that define a corresponding number of individual hypervideo control, marks, actions, or functions.

Col. 5, lines 39-54.

In addition, Hubbell discloses "hypervideo controls that may be defined to exhibit time-dependent transition characteristics that visually convey the current availability and impending unavailability of the user-actuatable controls during predefined portions of a multimedia presentation." (Col. 4, lines 46-50.)

However, Hubbell has not been shown to disclose or suggest "a player-navigator synchronization operation ... comprising: causing a multimedia player application to output a request command to the navigator program; and causing the multimedia navigator program to subsequently return to the player application ... (i) an event identifier notifying the multimedia player application when the requested command is completed and (ii) a status result status result indicating whether the request command succeeded or failed," as presently recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action appears to suggest that the "marks" of Hubbell correspond to the claimed event identifier and status result. However, as discussed during the interview, the marks of Hubbell cannot be considered to be event identifiers or status results, as those terms are used in Applicant's application. Independent claim 1 has also been amended to clarify the meaning of the terms event identifier and status result.

Kim was cited for its alleged teaching of a DVD having DVD formatted content and a navigator, which enables extraction of cell information and precise playback information. However, Kim fails to remedy the deficiencies in Hubbell noted above with respect to independent claim 1. For example, Kim fails to disclose or suggest "a player-

navigator synchronization operation ... comprising: causing a multimedia player application to output a request command to the navigator program; and causing the multimedia navigator program to subsequently return to the player application ... (i) an event identifier notifying the multimedia player application when the requested command is completed and (ii) a status result status result indicating whether the request command succeeded or failed,” as presently recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Hubbell and Kim whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined).

Dependent claims 3-13 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 19, 2007

By: /David A. Divine/
David A. Divine
Lee & Hayes, pllc
Reg. No. 51,275
(509) 324-9256 ext. 233